

### **REMARKS**

The specification is amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter is introduced.

In the Office Action dated June 21, 2007, Claims 1–7 and 23 were objected to as containing informalities. Claims 1, 5 and 7 are cancelled, thus mooted the objection as to these claims. Claims 2–4, 6 and 23 are amended to remove the objectional grammar as suggested by the examiner.

Claims 1–22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd paragraph as being indefinite. Independent claims 1 and 7 are cancelled, thus mooted the rejection. New independent claims 28 and 29, which replace claims 1 and 7, respectively, do not contain the references to “interrelationships between basic constituent elements” and to “business logic” that the examiner deemed to be indefinite.

Claims 1–27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. 2002/0026632 (“Fuchs”). Independent method claim 1 is cancelled. New method claim 28 is added. Dependent method claims 2–4 and 6 are amended to depend from new claim 28. Likewise, independent apparatus claim 7 is cancelled. New independent apparatus claim 29 is added. Dependent apparatus claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18–20 and 22–27 are amended to depend from new claim 29. New independent apparatus claim 30 and dependent claims 31–16 are also added. New claims 28–30, and the claims dependant thereon, are believed to be novel and patentably distinct over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

First, each independent claim includes the limitation of converting a database including a software program source code file and a non-source-code data file. Fuchs does not disclose this

limitation. Fuchs shows only a method and system for converting a single source code file to another language, not a data file written in a non-source-code format.

Second, new independent claims 28–30 include the limitation of deconstructing the entire source database system as a whole into basic constituent elements. Thus, when the target database is written as a function of the basic constituent elements according to the invention, the target file structure and environment do not necessarily correspond to the source database and environment file structure. For example, a source database system may consist of 2 data files and 4 source code files, which are collectively deconstructed into basic constituent elements, and a target database system that consists of only one data file and one source code file may be written based on these basic constituent elements. Fuchs, on the other hand, discloses a one-to-one conversion system where source code files are individually analyzed and translated to corresponding files.

Lastly, independent claims 28–30 include the limitation that the source database system, the resolved basic constituent elements, the templates, and the target database system are all stored in a common database 30. Howard, et al. spec. Fig. 2. Contrarily, Fuchs discloses a system in which the syntactical tree (basic software elements) are stored in a database file 6, but the source specification 4, the target specification 7 and the template 3 are not stored in the same database file 6. Fuchs Fig. 1. U.S. 6,698,014 (“Rechter”) is cited by the examiner for disclosing the step of storing source code to be converted, the deconstructed elements, and the target source code in a common database. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Rechter discloses a gateway database 18 with tables 19, in which are stored the deconstructed elements of the source code. The original source code and the converted code are clearly shown outside database 19. Rechter Fig. 1.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a database conversion system and method wherein numerous data and source codes files of differing types are collected, stored in a database, collectively deconstructed into basic constituent elements, and constructed into a target database system, which may have a wholly dissimilar file structure from the source database system yet retains the functionality of the source database system. As independent claims 28–30 are novel and patentably distinct, the claims depending thereon are also novel and patentably distinct.

In summary, claims 2–4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18–20, and 22–36 are pending in the application. Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance. Allowance of all claims and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Brett T. Cooke  
Reg. No. 55,836

Andrews Kurth LLP  
600 Travis, Suite 4200  
Houston, Texas 77002  
713-220-3813 (office)  
713-238-7163 (facsimile)  
Customer No. 23,444

Date: December 21, 2007